

REMARKS

Claims 1-4 were rejected based on 35 U.S.C. §112, first and second paragraphs. Claims 1-3, 5, 6, 8, 13 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) based on Jones. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) based on the combination of Jones and Aisenberg. The Applicant disagrees and traverses these rejections for at least the following reasons.

The Examiner essentially repeats the same arguments under §112, §102 and §103 that have been argued for over four years while this application was pending on appeal. The Examiner's positions are not supported by caselaw, the facts or the Applicant's earlier responses.

The only new rationale supplied by the Examiner appears to be the Examiner's misunderstanding of statements the Applicant made in her earlier papers. Earlier the Applicant explained that the words "or the like" meant --or its equivalent---. There is nothing indefinite about this language or explanation. Similar, this explanation does not make the claims indefinite or specification insufficient.

Further, as is apparent from all of Applicant's earlier papers (all of which are explicitly incorporated by reference in their entities, for each and every position, within this Response) the claims are definite and the specification sufficiently and unequivocally supports the subject matter set forth in the claims.

Nothing set forth in the specification, claims or Applicant's previous responses supports the Examiner's interpretation of the claims (that are directed at a hair and body dryer) and related rejection of claims with a reference that is aimed at drying automobiles. Again, the Applicant explicitly incorporates by reference in their entities, for each and every position, all of her previous responses, including those based on §112, §102 and §103, within this Response.

The Applicant is a small inventor and has had to endure years of delay. The Applicant is confident that the Board of Appeals will sustain her positions. The Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner either allow the pending claims or make the rejections final so that the Applicant can expedite appeal of these matters to the Board.

Respectfully submitted,

Capitol Patent & Trademark Law Firm, PLLC

By: /John E. Curtin/
John E. Curtin, Reg. No. 37,602
P.O. Box 1995
Vienna, Virginia 22183
(703) 266-3330